

EXHIBIT 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NORTHERN DISTRICT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 vs.) No. 3:16-cr-46
) Knoxville, Tennessee
) June 14, 2016
SZUHSIUNG HO,) 11:00 a.m.
)
 Defendant.)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE H. BRUCE GUYTON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: CHARLES E. ATCHLEY, JR. ESQ.
 U.S. Dept. of Justice
 Office of U.S. Attorney
 800 Market Street, Ste. 211
 Knoxville, Tennessee

For the Defendant: PETER R. ZEIDENBERG, ESQ.
 Arent Fox, LLP
 1717 K Street, NW
 Washington, D.C.

WADE V. DAVIES, ESQ.
Ritchie, Dillard, Davies &
Johnson, P.C.
606 West Main Street, Ste. 300
Knoxville, Tennessee

Lynda Clark, LCR #034, RMR, CRR
MILLER & MILLER COURT REPORTERS
12804 Union Road, Knoxville, Tennessee
Phone: (865) 675-1471 / FAX: (865) 675-6398
Email: JMccon3590@aol.com

1 So we would ask again for the Court to
2 consider pre-trial release.

3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, counsel.
4 Mr. Atchley.

5 Let me ask you first, Mr. Atchley, if you
6 agree with defense counsel's comments with regard to
7 the (g)(1) factor of a Federal Crime of Terrorism not
8 being applicable in this case?

9 MR. ATCHLEY: I do, Your Honor. As this
10 statute lays out within the meaning of terrorism
11 within the federal code, this is not a terrorism case.
12 It's a national security case. It's a very serious
13 case no matter how insignificant the defense may
14 allude to the technology involved here. But it's an
15 extremely significant case.

16 Your Honor, the defendant in this case is
17 charged with procuring and helping to obtain on behalf
18 of the Chinese government technology that it is not
19 allowed to have.

20 Now, Congress has been very explicit in
21 protecting this technology. It enumerates several
22 countries. The defense says this is not a case
23 involving Iran, and this is not a case involving North
24 Korea; all true, but China is on that list along with
25 Iran and North Korea.